

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 25-50 are objected to.

Claims 39, 43, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 25-31, 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 45 and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Himmel et al. (US 6,256,639 B1).

Claims 32, 35, 40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Himmel in view of Crandall et al. (US 6,321,228 B1).

Claim 45 has been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 25-27, 33, 35, 37-39, 41, 43, 44, and 46 have been amended.

Claims 25-44, and 46-50 remain pending.

In the Office Action dated April 2, 2011, the Examiner has objected to Claim 25 because the methods are not tied to a specific technology. Applicant has amended Claim 25 to include a processor for performing the steps of Claim 25.

Claims 33, 35, 37 and 39 were also objected to. Applicant has amended Claims 33, 35, 37 and 39 to more clearly point out the invention.

The Examiner has also objected to the specification, contending the term NAICS/SIC recited in Claim 39 is not defined. Applicant respectfully submits that the acronyms are well understood by an ordinary artisan -- as exemplified by the web page (<http://www.census.gov/epcd/www/sic.html>) published by the US Census Bureau. As evidenced by this web page, "NAICS" stands for North American Industry Classification System and "SIC" means Standard Industry Classification System. NAICS replaced SIC as of 1997.

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended Claims 26 and 27 to more clearly point out the invention.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 25-31, 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 45 and 48-50 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by *Himmel*.

*Himmel* discloses a searchable repository of bookmark sets uploaded by users and stored in a server. Each bookmark set, containing a set of Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) for retrieving web pages, can be downloaded to a client browser. When a search query from a client containing a set of keywords is received by the server, the stored bookmark sets are searched based on the set of keywords. A list of bookmark sets which satisfy the search query are presented to the user. Upon selection by the user, the selected bookmark set(s) are downloaded to the client browser. The downloaded bookmark set(s) can then be used by the client browser to access the URLs in the bookmark set(s). See Abstract, Fig. 5, and Col. 6, lines 62-66 of *Himmel*. Importantly, *Himmel* does not disclose a system that searches newly uploaded bookmark sets based on previously stored queries from users. In other words, the *Himmel* system searches previously uploaded information (i.e. bookmarks) only when the user initiates a search by submitting search queries to the system.

In contrast, Claim 25, as amended herein, now recites, among other steps:

*after storing the query in the system database, continually*  
monitoring by the information exchange to determine whether any newly  
uploaded information that is responsive to the query stored in the system

database has been added to the information exchange by the information sources;

determining at the information exchange whether the newly uploaded information from the information sources matches the query *previously stored in the system database*; and

sending, over the Internet, to the user the matched newly uploaded information.

Thus, the present invention, as required by amended Claim 25, processes new and responsive information that is uploaded after the search query is stored. *Himmel*, on the other hand, does not disclose or teach this limitation. In fact, according to *Himmel*, the user can only search for bookmark sets that were uploaded prior to the user's submission of a search query and will not update the user as to any subsequently uploaded bookmark sets.

It is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 25 has overcome the 102(b) rejection. For the same aforementioned reasons, dependent claims 26-31, 33,34, 36-39, 41, 42, 45, and 48-50 are also distinguishable over the *Himmel* reference. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 32, 35, 40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over *Himmel* in view of *Crandall*.

*Crandall* discloses a system and method that enable Internet users to access selected records retrieved from result sets derived from earlier search queries, and which track and rank selected records that users deemed valuable to a search query. When an Internet user submits a search query, the system creates three distinct but related queries for searching all accessible web

sites, a collection database and a rank database. The collection database includes a list of collections, i.e., records that other users deem relevant to a search topic and that are selected from result sets derived with earlier search queries; the collection database is organized in a folder/file based hierarchical format. The rank database includes Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) for identifying web sites that are bookmarked by other users. Each record in the collection and rank databases has an associated score that is used to organize records retrieved from those databases. Thus, when the user submits a search query to the system, it returns selected records from the collection and rank databases, in addition to other related web sites from the Internet. See Abstract and Fig. 8 of *Crandall*.

*Crandall* also does not disclose or suggest a system that retrieves newly uploaded information using previously stored search queries from the user as required by amended Claim 25. Like *Himmel*, *Crandall* also requires a user to submit a search query before the system would perform the requested search and the search query processes only the previously retrieved results and not on any subsequently uploaded information.

Accordingly, neither *Himmel* nor *Crandall*, singly or in combination, discloses all of the claimed limitations of amended Claim 25. It follows that each of dependent claims 32, 35, 40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 is patentable over the cited references for the same aforementioned reasons.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are therefore requested, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Early passage of this case to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 6, 2011

By /Chi Eng/  
Chi Eng  
Reg. No. 38,870  
(646) 770-2347